

REDACTED

BEFORE THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY
BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation
Against:

LANCY L. BOYCE, JR., M.D.
120 North Harrison
Wilmington, Delaware 19806

Respondent.

No. D-2267


N-12603

DECISION

The attached Proposed Decision of the Administrative Law
Judge is hereby adopted by the Board of Medical Quality
Assurance as its Decision in the
above-entitled matter.

This Decision shall become effective on October 18, 1979.

IT IS SO ORDERED September 18, 1979.


A. DAVID AXELRAD, M.D.
Secretary-Treasurer

BEFORE THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY
BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation
Against:

LANCY L. BOYCE, JR., M.D.
120 North Harrison
Wilmington, Delaware 19806

Respondent.

No. D-2267

N-12603

PROPOSED DECISION

The matter came on for hearing July 10, 1979 in Fresno, California, before Philip J. Hanley, an Administrative Law Judge of the Office of Administrative Hearings. Robert C. Cross, Deputy Attorney General, represented the complainant. Kenneth W. DeVaney, Esq., Fresno, represented the respondent, Lancy L. Boyce, M.D. Dr. Boyce was not present at the hearing.

Evidence was received and the matter was thereafter argued and submitted. The Administrative Law Judge certifies this decision and recommends its adoption.

FINDINGS OF FACT

I

Complainant Robert Rowland is Executive Director of the Board of Medical Quality Assurance of the State of California. Rowland filed the accusation in his official capacity.

II

On September 11, 1962 respondent Lancy L. Boyce, Jr., was issued Physician's and Surgeon's certificate No. C-24418 by the Board. Effective September 11, 1978, Boyce was placed on ten years conditional probation by the Board of Medical Quality Assurance pursuant to Accusation No. D-2110.

III

On separate dates in April, 1978 respondent Boyce administered controlled substances to himself: pentobarbital on April 12, 1978 and amobarbital on April 26, 1978.

Boyce was on probation to Fresno County Superior Court

beginning about February, 1978. The presence of the drugs was determined through tests administered by Boyce's probation officer and detected by laboratory analysis.

Boyce told the probation officer his own physician had given him medication. The probation officer telephoned the doctor's office and asked the receptionist who answered the telephone if medication had been given Boyce. She said it had and answered "It probably did" when further asked if the medication contained pentobarbital and amobarbital.

Some months later, Boyce's physician was asked by a State investigator about medications prescribed or given. The physician stated he prescribed only one medication, Vibramycin, for Boyce. Vibramycin does not contain pentobarbital or amobarbital.

IV

On May 17, 1978 respondent Boyce was intoxicated at a psychiatric crisis center where he worked several community service hours (as a condition of court probation) each week. The intoxication was manifested by Boyce's slurred speech, an unsteady gait causing him to bump into walls, and his slumping, falling or sitting on the floor of his office just inside his door. His appearance and manner were those of a person under the influence of alcohol.

Boyce's condition was such that he was a danger to his own physical safety and to his patients. Boyce had some patients on his calendar but was not allowed to see them.

Boyce on two prior occasions in April-May, 1978 was under the influence of alcohol when he reported to the crisis center for duty. Neither prior occasion was as extreme as the incident of May 17, 1978.

A supervising mental health nurse talked with Boyce on May 17 and asked why he had acted as he did. Boyce replied he "was very upset about this licensing situation." An administrative hearing had been held May 10, 1978 which led to the decision of September, 1978.

V

The decision effective September 11 was mailed about August 10, 1978. Two special investigators called on Boyce about 10:30 a.m. at his apartment on August 24, 1978. Boyce was intoxicated. He gave the inspectors a urine specimen. Laboratory analysis established ethyl alcohol content of 0.30% (equivalent to blood ethyl alcohol of 0.23%) and amphetamine presence of 0.02 mg%.

The intoxication of August 24 was not, in the circumstance, a condition which was a danger to Boyce or to patients. The amphetamine was in negligible amount. Amphetamine is a

controlled substance.

VI

Respondent Boyce gave the two investigators permission to search his professional office. The investigators found a prescription type bottle in a file cabinet in respondent's personal office. The bottle contained a number of double-scored white tablets. They appeared to be "Mini-Bennies" an amphetamine illegally manufactured. There was no name of the manufacturer either on the container or on individual tablets. Laboratory analysis determined the tablets contained amphetamine and caffeine.

Evidence establishes the amphetamine found in the urine specimen of August 24 was self-administered and was part of the illegal "Mini-Bennie" cache. Evidence establishes the substances were possessed by the respondent.

VII

The Superior Court found respondent in violation of probation on November 3, 1978. He was sent to Vacaville for evaluation but not as part of a criminal commitment. Boyce participated in the Impaired Physicians program for several months and was reinstituted on probation.

VIII

The incidents of April, May and August, 1978 occurred before the probationary decision of September, 1978 but occurred long after Accusation D-2210 was filed against respondent.

A witness was called by respondent's counsel to testify apparently about the illicit amphetamines found in respondent's office. After an explanation by respondent's counsel of the constitutional privilege against possible self-incrimination, the witness declined to testify. In the absence of opposing evidence, circumstances of August 24, 1978 establish possession and use of the amphetamines by respondent.

IX

After release from Vacaville, there was little evidence of respondent's actions. He moved to New Jersey and had employment to begin about June 20, 1979. An unfortunate development occurred.

Respondent's counsel advised the Deputy Attorney General of this prospective job. Counsel intended to show by the fact of employment that respondent was rehabilitated, or making substantial progress, and also to explain why the respondent was not present at the hearing. The Deputy Attorney General wanted to confirm the fact and nature of employment. He directed an investigator to write the prospective employer. When respondent appeared for work, he was told he would not be hired. Respondent is without

employment and resides in his mother's house in Delaware. The New Jersey employment was about \$40,000 annually.

DETERMINATION OF ISSUES

I

Respondent administered to himself amobarbital on April 26, 1978; pentobarbital on April 12, 1978 and amphetamine on August 24, 1978. Such administrations were violations of Health and Safety Code Section 11170 and are cause for discipline as instances of unprofessional conduct pursuant to Sections 2391.5 and 2361, Business and Professions Code.

II

Respondent illegally possessed amphetamines on August 24, 1978. Such possession was a violation of Section 11377(a), Health and Safety Code and Section 4230, Business and Professions Code, and cause for discipline under Section 2361(a), Business and Professions Code.

III

Respondent on May 17, 1978 used alcohol to the extent as to be a danger to himself and to patients in his professional practice. Such use was a violation of Section 2390, Business and Professions Code, and an instance of unprofessional conduct. The act constituted a cause for discipline pursuant to Section 2361, Business and Professions Code.

IV

The use of amobarbital, pentobarbital and amphetamine on the dates found were not established as constituting a danger to respondent, to patients or members of the public. Such uses are not causes for discipline for those reasons.

V


After cause for discipline has been found, it is proper to consider prior discipline. The acts constituting cause for discipline in the instant matter occurred while respondent was involved in a prior administrative process.

Respondent has offered no evidence of rehabilitation or professional progress for consideration. His former probation officer testified respondent participated in an Impaired Physicians program at Vacaville for several months. There was nothing additional except respondent had been offered employment in New Jersey.

ORDER

Certificate No. C-24418 issued to Lancy L. Boyce, Jr.,
is revoked. The order of revocation is made for each cause of
discipline found and determined and for all of them.

Dated: July 26, 1979


PHILIP J. HANLEY
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings

1 EVELLE J. YOUNGER, Attorney General
2 of the State of California
3 ROBERT C. CROSS,
4 Deputy Attorney General
5 555 Capitol Mall, Suite 350
6 Sacramento, California 95814
7 Telephone: (916) 445-0422

8 Attorneys for Complainant

9 BEFORE THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY
10 BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE
11 DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
12 STATE OF CALIFORNIA

13 In the Matter of the Accusation) No. D-2267
14 Against:)
15 LANCY L. BOYCE, JR., M.D.) ACCUSATION
16 2350 West Shaw Avenue)
17 Suite 124)
18 Fresno, California 93705)
19 License No. C-24418)
20 Respondent.)

21 Complainant Robert Rowland alleges:

22 I

23 Complainant is the Executive Director of the Board
24 of Medical Quality Assurance of the State of California and
25 makes this Accusation solely in such official capacity.

26 II

27 On or about September 11, 1962, respondent Lancy L.
Boyce, Jr., was issued Physician's and Surgeon's certificate
No. C-24418 by the Board. Effective September 11, 1978,
respondent was placed on ten years conditional probation by
order of the Board of Medical Quality Assurance pursuant to

1 Accusation No. D-2110. A copy of the Decision and Order
2 resulting from said Accusation is attached hereto as Exhibit A
3 and is incorporated herein by reference.

4 III

5 Business and Professions Code section 2360 (all
6 future Code references are to the Business and Professions
7 Code unless otherwise specified) provides that every medical
8 certificate issued may be suspended or revoked.

9 IV

10 Section 2361 provides that the Division of Medical
11 Quality shall take action against any holder of a certificate
12 who is guilty of unprofessional conduct. Section 2361(a)
13 provides that it is unprofessional conduct to violate or
14 attempt to violate any provision of the Business and Professions
15 Code regulating the practice of medicine.

16 V

17 Section 2390 provides that the self-prescription
18 or self-use of any Schedule I or Schedule II drugs specified
19 in the Health and Safety Code, or any Schedule III narcotic
20 drugs as specified in the Health and Safety Code, or any
21 dangerous drugs as specified in section 4211 of the Business
22 and Professions Code, or alcoholic beverages to the extent
23 or in a manner dangerous or injurious to the physician or to
24 any other person or to the public, or to the extent that
25 such use impairs the ability of the physician to safely
26 conduct the practice of medicine is unprofessional conduct.

27 / / / /

VI

Section 2391.5 provides that the violation of any federal or state statutes, rules, or regulations regulating narcotics, dangerous drugs, or controlled substances, is unprofessional conduct.

VII

Health and Safety Code section 11170 provides that no person may prescribe, administer, or furnish a controlled substance for himself.

VIII

Health and Safety Code section 11377 provides that it is unlawful to possess amphetamines except as provided in the pharmacy laws of this state (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 4211 et seq.).

IX

Section 4230 provides, in part, that a physician may only possess amphetamines when in stock in containers correctly labeled with the name and address of the supplier or producer of the drugs.

X

Amphetamines are Schedule II controlled substances pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 11055(d)(1) and are dangerous drugs pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 4211(c).

XI

Amobarbital and pentobarbital are Schedule III controlled substances pursuant to Health and Safety Code

1 section 11056(b)(1) and dangerous drugs pursuant to Business
2 and Professions Code section 4211(a).

3 XII

4 Between December 1977 and November 1978, respondent
5 Lancy L. Boyce, Jr., administered the following drugs to
6 himself:

- 7 (1) Amobarbital
8 (2) Pentobarbital
9 (3) Amphetamine

10 Such conduct on the part of respondent violated Health and
11 Safety Code section 11170 and is cause for disciplinary
12 action pursuant to sections 2391.5 and 2361.

13 XIII

14 Between December 1977 and August 24, 1978, respondent
15 Lancy L. Boyce, Jr., illegally possessed amphetamines. Said
16 amphetamines were illicitly manufactured and were stored in
17 respondent's office not in containers correctly labeled with
18 the name and address of the supplier or producer of the
19 amphetamines. Such conduct on the part of respondent violated
20 Health and Safety Code section 11377(a) and Business and
21 Professions Code section 4230. Such conduct on the part of
22 respondent is cause for disciplinary action pursuant to
23 section 2361(a).


24 XIV

25 From December 1977 through November 1978, respondent
26 Lancy L. Boyce, Jr., used amphetamines, amobarbital, pentobarbital,
27 and alcohol to the extent that it endangered his health and

1 impaired his ability to safely practice medicine. Such
2 conduct on the part of respondent is unprofessional conduct
3 pursuant to section 2390 and is cause for disciplinary action
4 pursuant to section 2361(a).

5 WHEREFORE, complainant prays that the Division of
6 Medical Quality hold a hearing on the matters alleged herein
7 and following a hearing issue a decision (1) revoking or
8 suspending the certificate of respondent (2) taking such
9 other and further action as is deemed necessary and proper.

10 DATED: December 5, 1978.

11
12 
13 ROBERT ROWLAND, Executive Director
Board of Medical Quality Assurance

14 Complainant
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

EXHIBIT A

BEFORE THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY
BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation
Against:

LANCY L. BOYCE, JR., M.D.
Certificate No. C-24418

Respondent.

NO. D-2110

N-10814

DECISION AND ORDER

The Division of Medical Quality hereby adopts the attached Proposed Decision of the Administrative Law Judge as its Decision in the above entitled matter, except that the proposed penalty is reduced in the following respects:

A. Probation condition No. 2 requiring immediate surrender of respondent's DEA drug permit is hereby deleted entirely. Therefore, the revocation stay order shall take effect without the necessity of satisfying this condition precedent.

B. Probation condition No. 3 placing a total restriction on respondent from prescribing all controlled substances and dangerous drugs is hereby modified to a partial restriction. As more particularly set forth in the penalty order below, respondent is not prohibited from prescribing controlled drugs listed in Schedules IV and V.

C. Probation condition No. 11 requiring respondent to render free community services is hereby deleted entirely.

Wherefore, the penalty order, as amended, reads in its entirety as follows:

ORDER

Certificate No. C-24418 issued to respondent Lancy L. Boyce, Jr., is revoked.

However, revocation is stayed and respondent is placed on probation for ten (10) years upon the following terms and conditions:

1. Respondent's certificate is suspended 20 days beginning the effective date of this decision.

2. Respondent must not prescribe, administer, dispense, or order controlled substances (and dangerous drugs), except for those drugs listed in Schedules IV and V in Health and Safety Code Sections 11057 and 11058.

3. Respondent must abstain completely from the personal use of controlled substances and dangerous drugs except those prescribed, administered or dispensed to respondent by another physician for a bona fide illness or condition.

4. Respondent must comply immediately with requests from the Division's designee to submit to biological fluid testing.

5. Respondent must obey all federal, state and local laws, and all rules governing the practice of medicine in California.

6. Respondent must comply with all terms of any court-imposed probation to which he is subject.

7. Respondent must comply with the Division's probation surveillance program.

8. Respondent must appear in person for interviews with the Division's medical consultant upon request at various intervals and with reasonable notice.

9. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, respondent must submit to the Division for its prior approval the name and qualifications of a psychiatrist of his choice. Dr. Lewis Wesselius is hereby approved. Respondent must undergo psychiatric treatment by the approved psychiatrist and must have the approved psychiatrist furnish quarterly progress reports to the Division.

10. Respondent must submit quarterly declarations under penalty of perjury on forms provided by the Division, stating whether there has been compliance with all the conditions of probation.

11. In the event respondent should leave California to reside or practice outside the State, respondent must notify the Division of the dates of departure and return. Periods of residing or practice outside California will not apply to the reduction of this probationary period.

If respondent violates probation in any respect, the Division, after giving respondent notice and the opportunity to be heard, may move to set aside the stay order and impose the revocation of respondent's certificate. Upon successful completion of probation, respondent's certificate will be fully restored.

This Decision shall become effective on September 11, 1978

SO ORDERED August 10, 1978

DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY
BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE

By Michael J. Carella
Michael J. Carella, Ph.D.
Secretary-Treasurer

FL:jw

BEFORE THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY
BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation
Against:

LANCY L. BOYCE, JR., M.D.
Certificate No. C-24418

NO. D-2110

N-10813

Respondent.

PROPOSED DECISION

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing before Robert R. Coffman, an Administrative Law Judge of the Office of Administrative Hearings, on May 10, 1978 in Fresno, California.

The complainant was represented by Karl S. Engeman, Deputy Attorney General.

The respondent appeared in person and was represented by Kenneth W. De Vaney, his attorney.

Evidence was received, the hearing was closed and the matter was submitted. The Administrative Law Judge certifies this decision and recommends its adoption.

FINDINGS OF FACT

I

Robert Rowland made the Accusation and the Supplemental Accusation in his official capacity as Executive Director of the Board of Medical Quality Assurance.

II

Respondent, Lancy L. Boyce, Jr., M.D., on or about September 11, 1962, was issued Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. C-24418 by the Board to practice medicine and surgery in the State of California and at all times mentioned herein respondent was and now is licensed by the Board to practice medicine and surgery in this State.

III

Respondent is guilty of unprofessional conduct as defined by section 2391.5 and thereby subject to discipline pursuant

to section 2361 in that respondent violated statutes of the State of California relating to controlled substances as more particularly set forth hereinafter:

(a) Respondent issued the prescriptions described in Schedule A, attached hereto and by this reference made a part hereof as if fully set forth herein, which prescriptions are false and fictitious in that the names of the respective patients and their respective addresses are false and fictitious. Respondent thereby violated section 11157 of the Health and Safety Code.

(b) Respondent administered and furnished the controlled substances described in Schedule A, attached hereto and by this reference made a part hereof as if fully set forth herein, to himself, thereby violating section 11170 of the Health and Safety Code.

(c) Respondent obtained the controlled substances described in Schedule A, attached hereto and by this reference made a part hereof as if fully set forth herein, by deceit, misrepresentation and subterfuge, and made false statements in the prescriptions relating to said controlled substances, thereby violating section 11173 of the Health and Safety Code.

(d) Respondent, in connection with the prescribing of the controlled substances described in Schedule A, attached hereto and by this reference made a part hereof as if fully set forth herein, used false names and false addresses, thereby violating section 11173 of the Health and Safety Code.

IV

Respondent is guilty of unprofessional conduct as defined by section 2390 and thereby subject to discipline pursuant to section 2361 in that between on or about September 26, 1977, and on or about October 17, 1977, respondent used and administered to himself controlled substances specified in Schedule II of section 11055 of the Health and Safety Code, to wit, Demerol. During said period, respondent used approximately 1,500 mg. during each twenty-four hour period.

V

Demerol and Meperidine, also known as Pethidine, are defined as controlled substances, Schedule II, pursuant to section 11055(c)(14) of the Health and Safety Code and section 1308.12(c)(14) of the Code of Federal Regulations.

VI

Leritine, also known as Anileridine, is defined as a controlled substance, Schedule II, pursuant to section 11055(c)(2) of the Health and Safety Code and section 1308.12(c)(2) of the Code of Federal Regulations.

VII

Respondent is guilty of unprofessional conduct as defined by section 2384 and thereby subject to discipline pursuant to section 2361 in that respondent was convicted of a charge of violating a California statute regulating controlled substances as more particularly set forth hereinafter:

On or about February 2, 1978, in the Superior Court for the County of Fresno, respondent was convicted, on his plea of guilty, of violating section 11173(a), four counts, of the California Health and Safety Code, a statute regulating controlled substances.

VIII

As a result of his conviction for violation of section 11173(a), respondent on February 4, 1978, was sentenced to probation for a period of 4 years on condition he pay a fine of \$2,000 at a rate of \$50 per month, devote one hour per week to public service for a total of 200 hours, abstain from the use of narcotic drugs and submit to urinalysis testing for narcotics.

IX

Respondent has conducted a private practice in psychiatry in Fresno since 1962. From 1955-1962 he served an internship, psychiatric residency, and military service.

X

Respondent has used controlled substances since at least 1974. In September and October 1977 he substantially increased his use of controlled substances to the extent of seriously impairing his ability to function as a clinician. His use of narcotics resulted in a seizure and subsequent hospitalization. While hospitalized respondent cooperated with narcotics bureau agents, freely admitting his involvement with narcotics.

Respondent has been under psychiatric treatment for depression and anxiety since 1974. He received treatment on a weekly basis until the past 6 months when he began seeing his psychiatrist once every 3-4 weeks. Respondent's psychiatrist believes that financial and social problems associated with respondent's marriage were a primary cause of his anxiety and depression. As respondent's marital and financial situation worsened, his involvement with narcotics increased until the September-October 1977 episode. The psychiatrist recommends respondent continue treatment indefinitely.

Respondent has been drug free since October 1977. He has undergone testing for narcotics under his Court probation, at first 2-3 times per week, now once every 1 to 2 weeks.

Respondent filed under Chapter XI bankruptcy. He is subject to a plan that is paying off his creditors, allowing him \$850 per month living expenses, and his wife \$350 per month. He has obtained an interlocutory divorce decree, scheduled to be final in

June 1978.

Respondent currently practices approximately 50 hours per week. He devoted 75 to 80 hours per week to his practice prior to October 1977.

DETERMINATION OF ISSUES

I

Cause has been established for discipline under sections 2361, 2390 and 2384 of the Business and Professions Code.

II

Respondent violated sections 11157, 11170, 11173 and 11174 of the Health and Safety Code, constituting grounds for discipline under section 2391.5 of the Business and Professions Code.

ORDER

Certificate No. C-24418 issued to respondent Lancy L. Boyce, Jr., is revoked. Upon satisfaction of condition (2) revocation shall be stayed and respondent placed on probation for ten (10) years upon the following terms and conditions. The period of probation shall not begin and respondent's certificate shall remain revoked until condition (2) has been fulfilled.

1. Respondent's certificate is suspended 20 days beginning the effective date of this decision.
2. Respondent must surrender for cancellation his DEA permit together with any triplicate prescription forms and federal order forms to the Drug Enforcement Administration and must provide documentary proof of that surrender no later than the effective date of this decision.
3. Respondent must not prescribe, administer, dispense or order controlled substances and dangerous drugs.
4. Respondent must abstain completely from the personal use of controlled substances and dangerous drugs except those prescribed, administered or dispensed to respondent by another physician for a bona fide illness or condition.
5. Respondent must comply immediately with requests from the Division's designee to submit to biological fluid testing.
6. Respondent must obey all federal, state and local laws, and all rules governing the practice of medicine in California.
7. Respondent must comply with all terms of any

court-imposed probation to which he is subject.

8. Respondent must comply with the Division's probation surveillance program.

9. Respondent must appear in person for interviews with the Division's medical consultant upon request at various intervals and with reasonable notice.

10. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, respondent must submit to the Division for its prior approval the name and qualifications of a psychiatrist of his choice. Dr. Lewis Wesselius is hereby approved.

Respondent must undergo psychiatric treatment by the approved psychiatrist and must have the approved psychiatrist furnish quarterly progress reports to the Division.


11. Within 30 days of this decision, respondent must submit to the Division for its prior approval, a community service program in which respondent must provide for medical services on a regular basis to a community or charitable facility or agency for at least 15 hours a month for the first 3 years of probation.

12. Respondent must submit quarterly declarations under penalty of perjury on forms provided by the Division, stating whether there has been compliance with all the conditions of probation.

13. In the event respondent should leave California to reside or practice outside the State, respondent must notify the Division of the dates of departure and return. Periods of residing or practice outside California will not apply to the reduction of this probationary period.

If respondent violates probation in any respect, the Division, after giving respondent notice and the opportunity to be heard, may move to set aside the stay order and impose the revocation of respondent's certificate. Upon successful completion of probation, respondent's certificate will be fully restored.

Dated: 5-19-78


ROBERT R. COFFMAN
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Administrative Hearings

<u>DATE</u>	<u>RX#</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>DRUG</u>	<u>STRENGTH</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
1. 9-22-77	17185H50	N L		Leritine	25 mg./cc.	30 cc.
2. 9-23-77	17185H52	P F		Leritine	25 mg./cc.	30 cc.
3. 9-29-77	17185H56	F B		Meperidine	50 mg./cc.	30 cc.
4. 10-1-77	17185H57	C N		Demerol	50 mg./cc.	30 cc.
5. 10-3-77	17185H58	C N		Demerol	50 mg./cc.	30 cc.
6. 10-3-77	17185H59	N D		Demerol	50 mg./cc.	30 cc.
7. 10-5-77	17185H65	N S		Demerol	50 mg./cc.	30 cc.
8. 10-5-77	17185H60	N L		Leritine	25 mg./cc.	30 cc.
9. 10-9-77	17185H62	C N		Demerol	50 mg./cc.	30 cc.
10. 10-10-77	17185H63	J R		Demerol	50 mg./cc.	30 cc.
11. 10-13-77	17185H64	P Y		Demerol	50 mg./cc.	30 cc.

SCHEDULE A